

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
HARRISONBURG DIVISION**

IN RE: **Morton Craig Skaggs
Laurie Lynn Skaggs**

**OBJECTIONS TO
EXHIBITS AND WITNESS PROPOSED
BY DEFENDANTS**

**MORTON CRAIG SKAGGS
LAURIE LYNN SKAGGS**

Case number: 17-50941

v.

**STEPHEN W. GOOCH, ESQ. and
STEPHEN W. GOOCH, P.C.**

COMES NOW the Debtors, Morton Craig Skaggs and Laurie Lynn Skaggs, by counsel, pursuant to the Pre-Trial Order of this Court entered September 14, 2022, and pursuant to the Memorandum Opinion and Court Order entered August 9, 2022, and files this Objection to the proposed exhibits filed by Defendants as follows:

WITNESSES

1. Plaintiffs raise a relevance object to the proposed witness testimony of Christopher A. Jones. Pursuant to Memorandum Opinion and Court Order of August 9, 2022, the issue(s) at the hearing is appropriate remedial sanction and possible good faith or Respondent(s). Based on Discovery, there was no communication of any kind between Respondent or Respondent law firm and Christopher A. Jones during the dates at issue in this case.

EXHIBITS

2. Defendant Exhibit A - Answers to Respondent's Request for Production of Documents - Plaintiffs raise a relevance objection and hearsay objection. Pursuant to Rule 7026(b)(1) of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, discovery requests do not need to be admissible at trial in order to be appropriate, and are therefore not automatically admissible at trial in

total.. The Plaintiffs' answers are hearsay under Rule 801 (c) unless an exception applies, and no exception applies at this time for pre-trial admissibility purposes. The Plaintiff is expected to be present at trial and testify under oath. .

3. Defendant Exhibit B - Answers to Respondent's Interrogatories -Plaintiffs raise a relevance objection and hearsay objection. Pursuant to Rule 7026(b)(1) of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, discovery interrogatory do not need to be admissible at trial in order to be appropriate, and are therefore not automatically admissible at trial in total.. The Plaintiffs' answers are hearsay under Rule 801 (c) unless an exception applies, and no exception applies at this time for pre-trial admissibility purposes. The Plaintiff is expected to be present at trial and testify under oath. .
4. Defendant Exhibit C - Answers to Respondent's Request for Admission - Pursuant to Rule 7026(b)(1) of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, discovery request for admission do not need to be admissible at trial in order to be appropriate, and are therefore not automatically admissible at trial in total.. The Plaintiffs' answers are hearsay under Rule 801 (c) unless an exception applies, and no exception applies at this time for pre-trial admissibility purposes. The Plaintiff is expected to be present at trial and testify under oath.
5. Defendant Exhibit D - Respondent's Request for Admission without answers thereto - Pursuant to Rule 7026(b)(1) of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, discovery interrogatory do not need to be admissible at trial in order to be appropriate, and are therefore not automatically admissible at trial in total.. Unanswered request for admission are simply not relevant to the issues before this Court.

/s/ Roland S. Carlton, Jr.
Counsel

Roland S. Carlton, Jr., Esq.
Carlton Legal Services, P.L.C.
118 MacTanly Place
Staunton, VA 24401
(540) 213-0547
V.S.B. #34138

CERTIFICATE

I, Roland S. Carlton, Jr., Esq., do hereby certify that a true and accurate copy of this Objection to Exhibits and Witness proposed by Defendants was delivered by ECF on October 31, 2022 to:

W. Taylor Corbett, Esq.
Stephen W. Gooch, P.C.
113 Landmark Lane
Bristol, TN 37620
taylor@sgooch.com

Richard C. Maxwell, Esq.
Woods Rogers, PLC
10 South Jefferson Street, Suite 1800
Roanoke, VA 24011
rmaxwell@woodsrogers.com

/s/ Roland S. Carlton, Jr.
Roland S. Carlton, Jr., Esq.